



ISSN 1180-5218

**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**

Second Session, 40th Parliament

**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**

Deuxième session, 40^e législature

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

Monday 18 November 2013

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Lundi 18 novembre 2013

**Standing Committee on
General Government**

Committee business

**Comité permanent des
affaires gouvernementales**

Travaux de comité

Hansard on the Internet

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. The address is:

<http://www.ontla.on.ca/>

Index inquiries

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-3708.

Le Journal des débats sur Internet

L'adresse pour faire paraître sur votre ordinateur personnel le Journal et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative en quelques heures seulement après la séance est :

Renseignements sur l'index

Adressez vos questions portant sur des numéros précédents du Journal des débats au personnel de l'index, qui vous fourniront des références aux pages dans l'index cumulatif, en composant le 416-325-7410 ou le 325-3708.

Hansard Reporting and Interpretation Services
Room 500, West Wing, Legislative Building
111 Wellesley Street West, Queen's Park
Toronto ON M7A 1A2
Telephone 416-325-7400; fax 416-325-7430
Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario



Service du Journal des débats et d'interprétation
Salle 500, aile ouest, Édifice du Parlement
111, rue Wellesley ouest, Queen's Park
Toronto ON M7A 1A2
Téléphone, 416-325-7400; télécopieur, 416-325-7430
Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

STANDING COMMITTEE ON
GENERAL GOVERNMENTCOMITÉ PERMANENT DES
AFFAIRES GOUVERNEMENTALES

Monday 18 November 2013

Lundi 18 novembre 2013

The committee met at 1403 in committee room 2.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): This meeting is a go. We have a PC motion on the agenda which we had under discussion. Ms. Damerla?

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Thank you, Chair. I have a couple of amendments that I'd like to introduce now, amendments to the original motion that MPP Rod Jackson had introduced.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): Okay.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: I'm going to introduce three of them together, just in the interests of time and so that it gives the whole picture of what we are trying to do, so it's easy to follow.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): Do you have copies?

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Yes.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): As they're being distributed by the Clerk, we could start our conversation on three new amendments that have been introduced—amendments to the amendment—by Ms. Damerla.

Ms. Damerla.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Thank you, Chair.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): They're not numbered. Which one would you like to start with?

Ms. Dipika Damerla: I'd like to start with the one that starts, "The first paragraph of the motion...." That's number 1.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): The one that says, "I move that the first paragraph" is titled number 1. Number 2 is?

Ms. Dipika Damerla: "That subsection (1) be amended to read...."

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): Okay, and then 3.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Yes.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): Thank you. We'll start with 1.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Can I just read them in succession?

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): Yes, please.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: I move that the first paragraph of the motion be amended such that the wording "com-

mence on the next regular scheduled meeting date following the day in which this motion is passed, and will continue indefinitely, with the exception of meetings already agreed to by the committee" be removed and replaced with the following: "commence on Monday, December 2, 2013, and continue on each subsequent regularly scheduled Monday meeting date, until such time as the review is complete."

Motion number 2: that subsection (1) be amended to read: "Each caucus is allotted one witness per week, and that each witness is allotted a total of 65 minutes; that includes a five-minute opening statement, a series of 15-minute rotations of questions and statements by each party, concluding with a five-minute rotation of questions and statements by each party."

The last amendment: I move that the Clerk, in consultation with the Chair, be authorized to arrange the following with regard to Bill 105, Supporting Small Businesses Act, 2013:

(1) One day of public hearings during the committee's regularly scheduled meeting time on Wednesday, November 20, 2013;

(2) One day of clause-by-clause consideration during the committee's regularly scheduled meeting time on Wednesday, December 4, 2013;

(3) Advertisement on the Ontario parliamentary channel, the committee's website and Canada NewsWire;

(4) Witness presentations scheduled as the requests are received, on a first-come, first-served basis;

(5) Witness presentations scheduled in 20-minute time slots, with presenters provided up to five minutes for their presentation, followed by up to 15 minutes for questions from committee members, divided equally between caucuses;

(6) A deadline for written submissions be set for 6 p.m., Wednesday, November 27, 2013; and

(7) A deadline for filing amendments with the Clerk of the Committee be set for 12 noon on Friday, November 29, 2013.

To summarize, Chair, the intent of this set of three amendments is quite simple. It's to accommodate the request of both the NDP and the Conservatives to have hearings on Pan Am, but at the same time get some legislation moving. So it's a compromise.

What we're asking is that every Monday of the week that this committee sits, we can do Pan Am, and every Wednesday we can do other business that this committee

is looking at concurrently, which would include Bill 105 and auto insurance. So that's what we are requesting.

The reason we keep emphasizing—and that's what number 1 and number 2 and what number 3 essentially does: In order to fit everything in, we needed to just change a little bit. Instead of doing committee hearings on Mondays and Wednesdays, if you're going to do committee hearings only on Wednesday for Bill 105, we just had to change a little bit of some of the details around the public hearings.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): Ms. Damerla, thank you for that overview. Now what we have to do is debate the amendments one by one.

So we go on the first amendment. Are there any speakers to the first amendment? Ms. Damerla.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Thank you, Chair. So as I mentioned in my slight—

Interjection.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Sorry. Laurie, did you want to say something?

Ms. Laurie Scott: I think we just need a second on that question. Is that okay?

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): Yes, of course, if you'd like a moment.

Ms. Peggy Sattler: Point of order.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): Yes?

Ms. Peggy Sattler: Can you just clarify how we're going to proceed? Are we going to deal with each amendment separately—

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): That's correct.

Ms. Peggy Sattler: —and vote on each amendment separately—

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): Yes.

Ms. Peggy Sattler: —but they've been presented all together.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): We allowed them to be presented and all three to be read into the record, but we will be discussing them one by one.

Ms. Peggy Sattler: Okay.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): So the first is the first amendment, which we have titled number 1.

Would you like a five-minute recess?

Ms. Laurie Scott: Sure.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): A five-minute recess.

The committee recessed from 1409 to 1414.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): The committee is called to order. We are on the amendment to the main motion, the first. Are there any speakers to this amendment? Ms. Damerla?

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Chair, I just wanted to elaborate a bit on what we are trying to accomplish. I think it's a little self-explanatory, to some extent. What we are trying to say is, let's divide up the committee to do two things concurrently: One is to do Pan Am for as long as we want to do Pan Am, and we'd do that every Monday; and that we do Bill 105 or whatever other committee

business every Wednesday. All we're saying is, instead of using up both days of the week for Pan Am indefinitely, how about we pick one day for Pan Am and one day a week for other business? It's as simple as that. The other thing that we're asking—well, that's what amendment number 1 asks for.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): We're just dealing with 1?

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Yes.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): Any further debate?

Ms. Sarah Campbell: Well, our position, quite simply, is just that the NDP recognizes that Bill 105 is an important initiative. It's an NDP initiative. It's something that we have supported, but we have come to an agreement at subcommittee whereby all three parties were able to move forward their priorities. We came to somewhat of an agreement, and I believe we should stick to that agreement. We should deal with the business that's already before committee before we start to introduce other things.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): Thank you very much. Is there any further debate?

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Just to clarify: My understanding is that at the subcommittee meeting, this amendment that was introduced by MPP Rod Jackson wasn't on the table. So are you suggesting that we just go back to what was discussed at that last subcommittee meeting and then this amendment by MPP Jackson is off the table? Is that what you're suggesting?

Ms. Sarah Campbell: No, no, that's not what I'm suggesting. I'm just suggesting that I think we may have come to sort of an informal agreement; not all of it was formalized at the subcommittee. We came to an agreement whereby the Liberals were able to put forward their priority, as was the NDP. The Progressive Conservatives did as well, and that's something that we're debating right now. So I believe that we should keep it fair, just a one-one-one kind of situation. We'll get through this business and then once we motor through that, we're welcome to discuss any further business.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): Thank you very much, Ms. Campbell. Is there any further debate on item number 1? Ms. Damerla?

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Chair, I'm just going to suggest two things. One is a little bit of clarification. My understanding is that that particular issue, each party having one priority put forward, was not discussed at the last subcommittee meeting. That is our understanding, but we're open to discussing that at a subcommittee. If that were the case, then I'm curious to see how it would work, because we're saying that Bill 105 is our priority. I'm going to guess that auto insurance is—

Ms. Sarah Campbell: No.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: No? Okay. All right. I don't know if this is the correct forum to be debating those priorities. I can see where you're going with that, but I just need clarification on what the priorities are.

Ms. Sarah Campbell: Chair, if I could? May I?

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): Ms. Campbell, in fact, if you go to the report of the subcommittee on Wednesday, October 30, it actually is on Bill 21 and it does identify those aspects.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Okay. Bill 21 would be the priority for the NDP? No? All parties, okay.

Ms. Sarah Campbell: No, no. My interpretation of the subcommittee is that the Liberals put forward Bill 21 as their priority, the NDP put forward an auto insurance review—the continuation of that—as our priority, and the Progressive Conservatives, I believe, are waiting for our next actual meeting to put forward their priority. So the point I'm trying to make is that the Liberals have already prioritized Bill 21, and so to now prioritize Bill 105—I'm just saying that we should deal with Bill 21, we should deal with auto insurance, and then we should listen to what the Conservatives have to say in terms of their priorities and we should move forward accordingly.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): So if I may just read this into the record so that there is an understanding. It says, at the end of the discussion:

“Your subcommittee met further to consider the method of proceeding on its standing order 111 study relating to the auto insurance industry and recommends the following:

“(11) That the committee meet on Monday, November 25, and Wednesday, November 27, 2013, for the purpose of continuing its study.”

Ms. Damerla?

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Thank you, Chair. The point is that Bill 21 is done. It's off the table. I just need a few minutes to explain why we need to get Bill 105 done before Christmas, before the House rises. I'm just going to re-explain that, because if we don't, February 15 is going to be the next time small businesses in Ontario are going to pay their health payroll taxes. If we don't do this in time, by January 1, on February 15 they won't get that break. It's as simple as that.

So the question we have to ask is, is that a priority for us here in Ontario or not, to ensure that beginning next year, our small businesses are between \$450,000 and \$500,000? We're raising that limit from \$450,000 to \$500,000. Do we want to make sure that, in a timely fashion, they get that break on the employer health tax? And if all of us are agreed on that, that's the reason we're putting that forward as a priority.

1420

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): Thank you. Ms. Campbell?

Ms. Sarah Campbell: Okay. With all due respect, I'd like to point out two points. First of all, according to this timetable, we would still have time to deal with Bill 105. The other thing is, again, with respect—

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Sorry. Which timetable?

Ms. Sarah Campbell: Well, just according to what we had discussed with subcommittee.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: But Bill 105 wasn't on the agenda of that.

Ms. Sarah Campbell: That's right. But in terms of the business that's before committee right now—

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Sorry. There's a little bit of confusion, because right now what's in front of the committee is all to the business of including Pan Am, which would take up so much time that we wouldn't get to Bill 105, and that's what we're trying to get to. That's what we're trying to solve. That's the issue.

They have put forward an amendment that says they would like to introduce another piece of new business in front of the committee, which is the Pan Am review. All we're saying is, instead of having every day of the week taken up by Pan Am review, can we just do one day a week Pan Am review and one day a week other business as we all decide? Our preference would be Bill 105.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): Further debate?

Ms. Laurie Scott: Some of it is just clarifications. What we've said before, I believe, in the last general meeting, not subcommittee meeting, is that you could send Bill 105 to another committee. We're not opposed to that.

We had proposed a motion, which you all have from the last committee, that was passed that—

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Sorry. It wasn't passed. The motion wasn't passed.

Ms. Laurie Scott: Well, what did we vote on?

Ms. Dipika Damerla: We didn't vote on this motion.

Interjections.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): It was on the floor. The motion is on the floor.

Ms. Laurie Scott: The motion is on the floor. What was the vote that took place? That's my clarification order. Nothing? We took a vote.

Interjection.

Ms. Laurie Scott: Okay. So the motion was to do the review of the Pan Am Games. You're bringing in—

Interjection.

Ms. Laurie Scott: Right. Then we're in here talking about how to make the motion that's before us happen. Okay. And you've made these three amendments to the motion.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Yes, essentially saying, instead of doing every day of the week, one day a week is Pan Am; the other days are open for other business.

Ms. Laurie Scott: Right. Okay. So you introduced all three. We've had kind of a general discussion. And then we need to vote one by one—

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): We're just on 1.

Ms. Laurie Scott: Okay. One by one. So we're just on the first one at the moment.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): That's correct. We're just on the first one.

Ms. Laurie Scott: Okay. I don't know if we have any more to add to 1 before we vote, but I just want to say, in respect to Bill 105, that we would like it moved—and it could be moved, with unanimous consent—to another committee for discussion, and that our priority would still

be the motion that's before us to investigate the Pan Am Games.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): Thank you, Ms. Scott. Mr. Fraser?

Mr. John Fraser: I just want to say that Bill 105 is, as you say, a priority for your side. It's a priority over here. I think what we have here is a very simple and clear way of doing it. I don't think it stops any other priorities that we had as a committee, which was insurance and the new Pan Am motion that's before us.

The only thing that's got a clock on it right now is Bill 105. That's the only thing that needs to get passed right now. We're looking at two days: one for hearing and one for clause-by-clause. I think it's reasonable. I think it's something that we can get done, and we can do it here, and we can continue on with the rest of the business of the committee.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): Thank you. Ms. Damerla?

Ms. Dipika Damerla: I also wanted to point out, just from a procedural point of view, as per your own motion, you would need five days to schedule a witness for your Pan Am review, so what would we do all day Wednesday? You won't have any witnesses for Wednesday, so why don't we just get on with other business?

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): Is there any further debate on item 1, the amendment? Any further debate on item 1? Ms. Campbell?

Ms. Sarah Campbell: Well, I think it needs to be said: I think this is a case of the Liberals playing a little bit cute. We were given an opportunity to raise our caucus priorities for this committee. If this is such a priority for the Liberal Party, why didn't they prioritize Bill 105, and why are they now waiting until after we've already discussed Bill 21, which was their priority? So I can appreciate the urgency.

Again, it needs to be stated that this is a priority for the NDP, but I think there also needs to be an element of fairness. I think that there is still enough time to do all of our priorities, including this one. But I think that we should continue on in a way—again, I want to stress fairness—in a way that is fair to the Progressive Conservatives as well.

The Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): I'm ready to allow a little leeway here, but we're supposed to be speaking to the amendment to the main motion, which is number 1. Mr. Fraser.

Mr. John Fraser: I just want to remind you that we've debated this bill for 14 and a half hours. That's 14 and a half hours for a very simple bill that speaks to something that you supported in the budget. I think if we take a look at the schedule right here, we have some room. This Wednesday, we're not going to be calling any witnesses to committee because it's not going to fit into the timeline that we've set out in the motion. We've got a blank day here at the end, so there's lots of time here to deal with all of the priorities of the committee. I think that we should support this motion.

The Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): Ms. Damerla.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: I just wanted to respond to the NDP member, Sarah Campbell. I agree with you: We need to work together, and each of us can push forward our priorities. Bill 21 is done. That doesn't mean the government doesn't continue to have priorities. We have Wednesday that we can't move forward with the Conservative proposal, because by their own motion, they cannot have a witness on Wednesday. So I'm just trying to figure out a way that we can all work together and work on committee. Otherwise, Wednesday will be just lost.

I take your point that Bill 21 is done, but all we're trying to say here is that the way it's worded now, only one party's priority will take up all of the time indefinitely. You, as the NDP, will not be able to put forward any of your priorities either. Once this motion passes, that's all we're going to do, because if you read the motion carefully, it says that indefinitely we're going to do a review of the Pan Am Games. Is that what you want? If you really want to put forward your priorities, then I urge you to work with us.

The Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): Mr. Fraser.

Mr. John Fraser: I just wanted to add one more thing. Out of the three things that are in front of us right now, this is the only one that has got a time stamp on it, and it's the only one that's actually going to put money in small businesses' pockets. I just want to remind the committee of that. I think it's very important and I think that's why we should support that motion.

The Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): Any further debate on the amendment to the main motion, amendment number 1? Any further debate? Ms. Damerla.

Ms. Peggy Sattler: Can we have a recess?

The Chair (Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield): Yes, you may. Would you like five minutes?

Ms. Peggy Sattler: Five minutes, yes.

The committee recessed from 1428 to 1435.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I call the meeting back to order. Okay, we're going to continue with amendment number 1. Is there any further discussion? Ms. Sattler?

Ms. Peggy Sattler: Yes. I just have a question, through you, Chair, to the Clerk, I think. I think we are all agreed that there are a number of important priorities for all three parties: auto insurance is a priority, the Pan Am Games are a priority and Bill 105, supporting small businesses, is also a priority. I am also concerned about the wording of the PC motion related to "continue indefinitely." I'd like some clarification from the Clerk as to whether supporting this motion would tie up the committee for the next four weeks or longer by the wording "continue indefinitely." Can you clarify what it is we would be agreeing to by supporting those words, in particular "continue indefinitely"?

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Sylwia Przewdziecki): A committee cannot bind itself. The committee, if it were to pass this motion, could come back in a day

or two, or at the next meeting, and further amend its agenda to include other items into it.

Ms. Peggy Sattler: Okay, so it's not binding? If this motion passes, which would bring up the Pan Am Games issue at the next meeting, there would still be an opportunity to amend, to put some limits on the length of time that the committee is going to be dealing with this issue.

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Sylwia Przewdziecki): Yes, that's a decision that the committee can make.

Ms. Peggy Sattler: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Any further discussion? Ms. Damerla.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: I just wanted to get some feedback from both parties. The way all of this stands, if the PC motion passes, essentially we have a hole on Wednesday. I take the Clerk's point that, at any time, we can amend it to make sure it's not indefinite, but right now, that's the way it is: indefinite. And I'm going to guess that to change it, it would need a majority vote. So we'd be back to that same discussion.

I'm just saying, why don't we have that discussion right now as to how long we should give each party their priority? Because right now, the one priority of the PC Party is taking all of the time, and the Liberal priority and the NDP priority are not in the picture. Why don't we just discuss that right now, to talk about how we can do an equitable allocation of time, as opposed to another day? It's just a suggestion.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Thank you. Mr. Fraser.

Mr. John Fraser: I just want to reiterate and add again that this is something we all agree on. It's not about a priority for any one party. It's a priority for people in small business. We've all agreed on that. So as far as a priority is concerned, I think that should be at the top of the list, and we can find a way to get this done. I'm not suggesting that we put other things aside. That's my suggestion.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Thank you. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. Rod Jackson: Yes. I just want to remind everybody that we have actually voted to make this Pan Am investigation happen immediately—in the original motion. What this motion in front of us does is actually state the parameters of how this investigation will go forward. To debate when it's going to happen is kind of moot, because we've already voted as a committee in favour of making this investigation happen immediately.

I suggest that we call the vote. Obviously, we need to start talking about the actual motion in front of us. We've already decided that this is going to happen immediately. Talking about when we're going to start it and if anything is going to happen before it is a moot point. As I've said before, we've already determined that it's going to happen immediately. Let's get on with the business of how we're going to get through this and move it along, so that we can move the agenda along.

This is starting to get a little bit frustrating, hearing the other side repeat themselves about when this is going to start and other priorities and whatnot. We've determined what the priorities of this committee are going to be right now, and it's the Pan Am Games. We've made that determination with the motion that we passed originally.

1440

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Thank you. Ms. Damerla.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: I just want to say to MPP Jackson, I don't think anybody is debating whether the Pan Am review should take place. That train has moved along or that bus has left. What we are trying to figure out is how all parties, in the limited time that we have, can put forward their priorities, as opposed to one priority taking up all of the time. That's all we're seeking at this point. Nobody is debating the fact that this review is going to take place. All we are asking for is—what if we took Bill 21 and just tied up the committee forever on Bill 21? That would not have been fair. That's all we're saying.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Thank you. Ms. Campbell.

Ms. Sarah Campbell: I'd like to call the question, Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Okay. Thank you very much. Is there any further discussion? Mr. Fraser.

Mr. John Fraser: I'll remind everybody that we have a blank day on Wednesday and that we're not going to be able to do the business that the member is putting forward. We're not going to be able to call witnesses.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Ms. Scott.

Ms. Laurie Scott: It says that for witnesses, you can still call people for Wednesday, I believe. Right? We had in there—which we can make an amendment to remove, if you want—that we could call people. We're getting into a process right now. We just want to vote on one amendment at a time, as my colleague has said. You're into details of the process at the moment.

Am I correct, Clerk, that we can still call someone—they're all witnesses, aren't they? So if we decided to call someone within the bureaucracy for Wednesday, is that possible?

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Sylwia Przewdziecki): Yes, if the committee wanted to invite someone to appear.

Ms. Laurie Scott: You're saying that it's a wasted day, but it doesn't have to be.

Mr. John Fraser: In fairness, in the motion that's before us, it says "five days," and if the committee wants to be able to—

Interjection.

Mr. John Fraser: No, it says in his motion—

Ms. Peggy Sattler: Point of order.

Interjection.

Mr. John Fraser: So just in terms of the committee's ability to prepare and a witness's ability to prepare, that's why I'm suggesting—

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Point of order. Ms. Sattler.

Ms. Peggy Sattler: We're not talking about the motion right now. We're talking about the amendment.

Mr. John Fraser: That's fine. Understood.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Ms. Damerla.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Chair, I just wanted to say—they've asked for a vote on this, but I just wanted to flag that I do have other amendments. I just wanted to flag that for you procedurally so that I do get a chance, once we have voted on this. If required, I will have other amendments.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Okay. Any further discussion? I'll call the question. Those in favour? Those opposed? The motion is defeated. Amendment 1 is defeated.

We'll move to amendment 2. Any discussion on amendment 2?

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Chair, can we ask for a 15-minute recess?

Ms. Laurie Scott: Ten.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Ten? Fine, 10.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): We'll recess for 10 minutes.

The committee recessed from 1443 to 1455.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): The 10-minute recess has completed, so I guess we are moving back to the—oh, Ms. Damerla?

Ms. Dipika Damerla: So, Chair, given that our first amendment failed, it makes amendments numbers 2 and 3 moot at this point, so I'm going to withdraw them. Instead, I am going to introduce a fourth amendment. I believe—

Interjection.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: All I said was that we are withdrawing 2 and 3, so we're introducing amendment number 4. I believe the Clerk has copies—I don't know if they've been distributed—so, with your permission, I'll go ahead and read it into the record.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Yes, go ahead.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Thank you. I move that the first paragraph of the motion be amended such that the following wording be added after "with the exception of meetings already agreed to by the committee": "and December 4 and December 9, such days to be devoted to consideration of Bill 105, Supporting Small Businesses Act, 2013."

So what this essentially does is—all we are saying is, give us two days out of the rest of the committee business days for Bill 105. We are taking the last possible two days, so, really, it's at the bottom of the list. The rest of the time, beginning immediately—which is, I guess, when we are past this amendment—can be devoted to the Pan Am review, if the committee so wishes. That's essentially what our amendment is seeking, that every party get a fair shake at committee time, and we are saying that we'll move ours to the last two days in December. That's the last possible day that we can do Bill 105 and still get

it done in time for the new year, January 1, 2014. Thank you, Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Thank you. Any further discussion?

Ms. Peggy Sattler: Can we have a recess? Five minutes?

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Yes, a five-minute recess.

The committee recessed from 1456 to 1501.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I'll call the meeting back to order—after a five-minute recess. Is there any further discussion on the amendment? There being none, I shall call the question for a vote.

Mr. John Fraser: Recorded vote.

Ayes

Cansfield, Damerla, Fraser.

Nays

Campbell, Harris, Jackson, Sattler, Scott.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): The motion is defeated.

We're back to the original motion. I would ask, is there any further discussion on the motion?

Interjection: I'm sorry, would you say that again?

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Is there any further discussion on the original motion? Once again, is there any further discussion on the original motion? Ms. Sattler.

Ms. Peggy Sattler: Yes, just again on a process question—through the Chair, my question may be directed to the Clerk. Would there be a subcommittee meeting convened to talk about dealing with this business, if this motion passes? The last subcommittee report just referred to those two days, the 25th and the 27th, for auto insurance. Would there have to be another subcommittee meeting held to talk more specifically about how this motion is to be carried through, if it passes?

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Sylwia Przewdziecki): That would be up to the committee. The committee could make certain decisions on how it wishes to proceed right here in full committee, or one of the subcommittee members could ask the Chair to call a subcommittee meeting for further discussion.

Ms. Peggy Sattler: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Mr. Fraser.

Mr. John Fraser: Just for my own edification, when this motion is passed, what is our organization over the next four weeks in sittings?

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Following business here, I was going to be asking if there was a request for another subcommittee meeting to deal with specifics regarding the 25th and the 27th—which is specific, I believe, to the auto insurance issue—to determine how we could potentially move forward with that. Again, it's up

to the committee here as a full committee to provide some direction.

Mr. John Fraser: Thank you.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Any further discussion on the original motion? There being none, I shall call for a vote on the question. Those in favour of the original motion? Any opposed? The motion's carried.

Is there any other business of the committee? There being none, I would just like to mention, as I had mentioned previously, is it the wish of the subcommittee to meet again to determine how we're going to move forward with the auto insurance issue?

Ms. Laurie Scott: Can we just ask for a five-minute recess right now before you get to that point on other business?

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Okay.

Ms. Laurie Scott: It's only five minutes.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): A five-minute recess. *The committee recessed from 1506 to 1511.*

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Okay. The five minutes is up. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. Rod Jackson: Thank you, Chair. It's my hope that committee, based on an earlier discussion—and certainly, I think, a mutual willingness by everybody not to waste a day—that the committee will agree to call Deputy Minister Steven Davidson responsible for the Pan Am Games on Wednesday so that we don't have to have an empty day there.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Ms. Damerla?

Ms. Dipika Damerla: We ask for a five-minute recess, Chair.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Okay. For our members from the third party, there was just a request to fill in the Wednesday date with Deputy Minister Steven Davidson responsible for the Pan Am Games.

Ms. Sarah Campbell: Chair, who made that motion or that suggestion?

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Mr. Jackson, and Ms. Damerla has asked for a five-minute recess. So I shall grant the five-minute recess, effective immediately.

The committee recessed from 1512 to 1517.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I call the meeting back to order after a five-minute recess. Any further discussion on the request? Ms. Damerla.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to suggest to the committee, building on what MPP Campbell said, that properly these issues, the details of how we proceed further with the review, should be discussed in a subcommittee meeting, before we just ad hoc say that we're calling this person or that person, just to decide on some of the terms. So I'm just going to request that we defer the details until we have a subcommittee meeting.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Okay. Any further discussion? Mr. Jackson.

Mr. Rod Jackson: Just in response to that, we would like to move on this and make sure that the Wednesday date is filled up. Actually, the reason I thought Steven Davidson might be a good, non-controversial ask is

because he's the deputy minister responsible. He has been through estimates on this subject to a certain extent. He's very familiar with the file. It is his portfolio. He's very capable and is aware that there's an impending investigation happening. So there are no surprises for this witness. He's probably expecting to be called, I would think, and I think will be able to provide some really insightful information for all of us. So I'm not sure that we're going to get any value from deferring this to subcommittee. He's kind of an obvious first choice, I think, a logical first choice to move ahead with.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Okay. Thank you. Any further discussion?

Ms. Dipika Damerla: I'm just going to reiterate that I think, typically, we would discuss all of this in a subcommittee before we went forward. So that would be my request. Thank you.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Any further discussion? There being none, we have a request to the committee to call the first witness on Wednesday, that being Mr. Steven Davison. Is it Davison or Davidson?

Mr. Rod Jackson: Davidson.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Davidson. So I guess I would call a vote on that?

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Is it a motion? Are you looking for unanimous consent?

Mr. Michael Harris: Just call the first witness. The motion states that we're having hearings, so he's the first in line, right?

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I think we would need to have the consensus of the committee to determine who we want to hear from or whom the committee would like to hear from.

Ms. Laurie Scott: Whatever the procedure is.

Mr. Michael Harris: Clerk, what is the procedure on calling witnesses?

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Sylwia Przedziecki): Sorry, can you repeat the question?

Mr. Michael Harris: What is the procedure on the committee formalizing this witness list or calling that first witness—

Ms. Laurie Scott: Do we have to have a vote, I guess is what we're saying.

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Sylwia Przedziecki): Well, I didn't understand that it was a formal motion that was moved that would require a vote. However, the committee did just pass a motion that set out a procedure with an advance notice of five days, so this would be contrary to what the committee passed. However, if the committee directs the Clerk to invite the deputy minister, then I will do as the committee requests.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Okay, so I would need, at minimum, some consent here on behalf of the committee to—

Interjections.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): There's no opposition?

Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield: No opposition.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Okay, so it will stand that there's consent of the committee to call the first witness, Mr. Steven Davidson, for Wednesday.

Okay, then, any further business? Ms. Campbell.

Ms. Sarah Campbell: I have a motion. I move that the Clerk of the Committee post information regarding the committee's business with respect to the standing order 111(a) auto insurance review in English and French on the Ontario parliamentary channel, on the Legislative Assembly website, and with the CNW newswire service immediately; and

That interested people who wish to be considered to make an oral presentation should contact the Clerk of the Committee as soon as possible; and

That the Clerk of the Committee, in consultation with the Chair, be authorized to schedule witness presentations on the standing order 111(a) auto insurance review as the requests are received, on a first-come, first-served basis; and

That presentations be scheduled in 35-minute time slots, and that groups and individuals be offered five minutes for their presentations, followed by up to 10 minutes for questions per caucus.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Thank you very much. We have a motion on the floor. Is there any further discussion on the motion? Am I allowed to ask a question?

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I would suspect that if this motion carries, then there's no need to convene a subcommittee meeting. That's basically what's happening. Is that correct?

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): I'm being advised that there could be more details that the Clerk would require in order to move forward with this, so perhaps a subcommittee meeting would also be necessary.

But for this particular motion, I'll ask for further discussion. Ms. Damerla?

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Just for clarification, which dates were these for?

Ms. Sarah Campbell: The dates that have already been agreed to at the subcommittee and that have been approved by this committee, which are Monday, November 25, and Wednesday, November 27.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Okay. I just wanted to confirm that.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Any further discussion? There being none, those in favour of the motion? Those opposed? The motion is carried.

Any further business? There being none, is it the will of the subcommittee members to meet following this particular meeting, or shall we—okay, no, there's no interest in that.

Ms. Campbell?

Ms. Sarah Campbell: Could we perhaps meet the morning of this Wednesday?

Ms. Dipika Damerla: We'll have to get back to the Clerk on that.

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): There has been a proposal for Wednesday morning, and perhaps the other members of the subcommittee could confirm that, and maybe the Clerk can advise us as to attendance of the three parties.

Interjection.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): What would the topic be? Well, perhaps the Clerk—

Ms. Sarah Campbell: The Chair suggested that we have a subcommittee.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): Perhaps the Clerk could just provide some more details as to what she's going to require in order to move forward with the auto insurance issue on November 25 and 27. Is there other information and direction that you need from the subcommittee?

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Sylwia Przewdziecki): Well, there are a number of details that are normally established by the subcommittee. I'll put the question to the research officer, but are there any directions to research at this point, what any of the committee's expectations might be with respect to research?

Ms. Sarah Campbell: I don't think so.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: There's no topic? You're just asking for a subcommittee meeting? There's no topic in mind?

Ms. Sarah Campbell: No, I wasn't asking for a subcommittee meeting. I put forward the motion, and the Clerk of the Committee had said that there may be some outstanding issues that were not addressed by this motion.

Ms. Dipika Damerla: Oh, okay.

Mr. Michael Harris: Such as?

Ms. Laurie Scott: We're finding out—or do you want to wait and then—can we do it now?

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Sylwia Przewdziecki): Well, such as any directions to the research officer. Are there any from the committee at this point?

Ms. Sarah Campbell: No.

The Chair (Mr. Grant Crack): There being none, then what we will do is I'll have further discussions with the Clerk. If there's a requirement for further information on her part, or direction from the subcommittee, I will convene a subcommittee meeting. Is that fair enough?

Okay, any further business? This meeting is adjourned.

The committee adjourned at 1525.

CONTENTS

Monday 18 November 2013

Committee business.....G-355

STANDING COMMITTEE ON GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Chair / Président

Mr. Grant Crack (Glengarry–Prescott–Russell L)

Vice-Chair / Vice-Présidente

Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield (Etobicoke Centre / Etobicoke-Centre L)

Ms. Sarah Campbell (Kenora–Rainy River ND)

Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield (Etobicoke Centre / Etobicoke-Centre L)

Mr. Grant Crack (Glengarry–Prescott–Russell L)

Ms. Dipika Damerla (Mississauga East–Cooksville / Mississauga-Est–Cooksville L)

Mr. John Fraser (Ottawa South L)

Mr. Michael Harris (Kitchener–Conestoga PC)

Ms. Peggy Sattler (London West ND)

Ms. Laurie Scott (Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock PC)

Mr. Jeff Yurek (Elgin–Middlesex–London PC)

Substitutions / Membres remplaçants

Ms. Mitzie Hunter (Scarborough–Guildwood L)

Mr. Rod Jackson (Barrie PC)

Clerk / Greffière

Ms. Sylwia Przedziecki

Staff / Personnel

Mr. Ian Morris, research officer,
Research Services